

The Charlotte Journal.

"Perpetual Vigilance is the Price of Liberty," for "Power is always Stealing from the Many to the Few."

CHARLOTTE, N. C. SEPTEMBER 18, 1850.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
AT \$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

NUMBER 41.

J. H. HOLT,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.
VOLUME XX.

From the Raleigh Standard, of August 21.

A Card—To the Public.

The undersigned finds himself compelled to appear before the public, in his own vindication.

It will be recollected that during the late canvass for Governor, he united with others in signing a certificate with reference to the position assumed by Gov. Manly in the discussion of the subject of the "Basis of Representation." At the time of signing that certificate, its authors had not the remotest idea that they were involving themselves in a difficulty with Gov. Manly in a matter of veracity, for they did not anticipate that he would deny the facts as set forth by them.

Their purpose, in setting forth the certificate, was to meet and correct the misrepresentations of a portion of the Whig press, who Editors were not present at the discussion, and of course could not know how the facts really were.

The Governor, however, greatly to the surprise of the undersigned, not only denied those facts, but couched his denial in terms of aggravated insult to the undersigned and his associates. Had he merely denied the facts, as set forth in that certificate, or had he, with some charity, allowed to the undersigned and his associates, even the alternative of having misapprehended his position, the undersigned, for many considerations, might have foreborne a further prosecution of the matter; but far from pursuing this course, Gov. Manly, in a letter, dated July 17th, 1850, addressed to Mr. Gales from Morganton, uses the following language:—

"The charge that I have come out in favor of changing the present basis of representation, under the Constitution, to the White Basis, either in the Federal or State Government, is utterly and unqualifiedly false, from whatever source it may have originated or been promulgated." Thus directly charging the undersigned and his associates with falsehood. The undersigned is thus forced, in defence of his own character for truthfulness, to prepare the proof which he herewith submits to the public—the issue of veracity having been neither made, desired, nor expected by him.

In calling the attention of the public to the letters and certificates which he exhibits, he will merely state,

1st. As to the letter from Rawley Galloway, Esq., that Mr. Galloway is a gentleman of as high character for integrity as lives in the State of North Carolina. He is a Whig, and was an elector who among others cast the vote of the State at the last Presidential Election.

2nd. Messrs. Dillard and Aiken are both decided and prominent Whigs in the county of Rockingham, and universally reputed as men of the highest standing and character.

3dly. Of those who signed the certificate herewith presented, many, viz: Richard H. Scales, Alex. Woodson, W. B. Johnson, James W. McCain, Samuel P. Adams and Robert Galloway are Whigs, and all are most respectable citizens of Rockingham.

The undersigned has no criminalities to make, but in the exhibition of this proof, he simply wishes to discharge a duty to himself and his associates, and he appeals to the public for his own and their vindication.

T. RUFFIN, Jr.

WENTWORTH, Aug. 9, 1850.

MR. GALLOWAY, DEAR SIR:—You have, I dare say, observed the controversy that has arisen as to the position assumed by Gov. Manly, in his speech here, on the subject of the Basis of Representation in North Carolina, and as I know you were present on that occasion, I have taken the liberty of addressing you this note to inquire of you,

1st. Whether or not you understood Gov. Manly as being in favor of abolishing the Federal or Black Basis in North Carolina, and of adopting a white one in its stead.

2dly. Whether you understood Col. Reid as opposing such a change or not.

Yours, with great respect,

T. RUFFIN, Jr.

Mr. Galloway's Reply.

WENTWORTH, August 9, 1850.

MR. RUFFIN, DEAR SIR:—I have received your note of this date, and in compliance with the request it contains, I make the following statement:

On the occasion to which you refer I understood Gov. Manly to say "that if he had the formation of a new Constitution for North Carolina, he would go farther in support of free suffrage than the gentleman himself (Col. Reid) and that while population should constitute the only basis of representation." In reply, Col. Reid asked "if he understood him correctly—are you in favor of abolishing the Federal Basis of representation?—is that your position?—will you stand up to it?—will you swear by it?" To which the Governor nodded his assent. The Col. then went on to remark that "that was precisely the position which the northern abolitionists would desire him to occupy, and that it was dangerous for the South."

Again, I understood Gov. Manly to be illustrating the inequality and injustice of the federal basis of representation, when he said 800 men in Onslow County were equal in political power to 4000 men in some of the western or mountain counties. And again, I understood Col. Reid to ask Gov. Manly how he could advocate so great a change in our State Constitution, when it was not mentioned in the Resolutions of the Whig Convention which nominated him, as two years ago, on the subject of free suffrage, he had assumed the position that he had no authority or right to commit his party to a new issue.

This brief recapitulation of points in the discussion sustains me, I think, in saying that my decided impression was that Gov. Manly was in favor of abolishing the Federal Basis of representation in our State Constitution, and that Col. Reid was opposed to it. With much respect, your ob't serv't,

R. GALLOWAY.

Appended to the above are the following: MR. RUFFIN. DEAR SIR: As I am requested to state my impression of the position of Gov. Manly at Wentworth, on the 20th of June last, in regard to the basis of representation, the foregoing letter of Mr. Galloway being shown me, I will say that I concur in the statements of Mr. Galloway fully, instead of repeating the same things at length on another piece of paper.

In addition to the facts set out in Mr. Galloway's note, I remember that Gov. Manly said that he was in favor of the mixed basis as in Congress, in order to the keeping up the equilibrium between the North and South. Yours, &c.

JOHN H. DILLARD.

MR. RUFFIN. DEAR SIR: In answer to your inquiry as to my recollection of Gov. Manly's position at Wentworth on the Basis of Representation I can say that I understood Gov. Manly to say in so many words that "if the Constitution was to be amended he would be in favor of the White Basis as to the State Government, but in favor of the mixed basis as to the General Government." Yours, &c.

GEO. L. AIKEN.

We, the undersigned, were present at Wentworth on the 20th of June last, and heard the discussion which then occurred between Gov. Manly and Col. Reid, and we have no hesitation in saying that on that occasion Gov. Manly distinctly and emphatically declared himself to be in favor of abolishing the Federal or Black Basis in North Carolina, and of instituting a white one in its stead.

W. B. CARTER,
RICHARD H. SCALES,
J. H. CARDWELL,
ALEXANDER WOODSON,
W. B. JOHNSON,
JAS. W. MCCAIN,
W. D. BEHRELL,
WILLIAM P. WATT,
JAMES P. SCALES,
D. W. COURTS,
WILLIAM A. WITHERS,
SAMUEL P. ADAMS,
ROBERT GALLOWAY,
S. C. EDWARDS,
E. R. HARRIS,
W. F. CARTER,
A. M. SCALES,
W. N. SCALES.

NOTE. The gentlemen whose names are in italics are Whigs.

From the Raleigh Register.
Letter from Governor Manly.

To the Editor of the Register: It is unpleasant and generally unprofitable to refer to the bickerings of a heated political campaign when the contest has ceased; or to reproduce the speeches that were made when the excitement, which called them forth, and invested them with a temporary interest has passed away.

An article, however, in the last Raleigh Standard, published by Mr. Thomas Ruffin, Jr., under the head of "A CARD—TO THE PUBLIC," wherein he gratuitously makes what he is pleased to call a question of veracity between himself and me, impels me from motives of self respect as well as a proper regard for the opinions of my friends, to make a brief statement upon the subject.

The discussion of such issues, whether assumed or real, in the newspapers, is, in my judgment, offensive to the public taste, for various reasons. Personal difficulties or misunderstandings among gentlemen, when they exist in fact, can always be adjusted more satisfactorily in private. I am not responsible for this intrusion upon the public, and truly regret the necessity which leaves me no other alternative.

In a cert. fide addressed to the editor of the Standard, dated Wentworth, July 16th, 1850, and signed by Mr. T. Ruffin, Jr. and others, and published on the 20th of that month, it is stated in substance, that they were present at the political discussion between my opponent and myself at Wentworth in Rockingham County, on the 20th June preceding, and that they understood me as declaring that I was in favor of abolishing federal population as the basis of representation in our Constitution, and of instituting white population in its stead; and further that I stated I was a better friend to equal suffrage than my opponent. Accompanying Mr. Ruffin's "Card to the Public" in the last Standard are published sundry other certificates of gentlemen, dated since the election was over, who were present on that occasion, and who affirm in substance that they also so understood me.

Now I do not undertake to say that these gentlemen have stated falsehoods, nor that they have corrupted and maliciously misrepresented me. By no means. I say my position was misunderstood. Whether this arose from any obscurity in the manner in which they were stated by me, that being my first speech in the campaign, or whether the impressions and opinions of those gentlemen were derived from unfounded inferences from my arguments, instead of legitimate conclusions, I know not. But by some means my position and opinions were misinterpreted by them, as I shall proceed to show.

On the 20th day of June last, I met my opponent for the first time during the campaign in his own county at Wentworth. I commenced the discussion and alluded briefly to several topics.

In regard to Equal Suffrage, I said or intended to say, as I had done many times before, that, by allowing the qualified voters in the House of Commons to vote also in the Senate, it was contended that this made them equal or gave them equal political power under our Constitution, it was a mistake; that it would not accomplish that object. By way of illustration, I argued that the county of Onslow formed one Senatorial District and was allowed one Senator. The counties of Wilkes, Caldwell, Burke and McDowell formed one Senatorial District and was allowed one Senator. That allowing all the free white men in those districts to vote for their Senators respectively, would not be granting to them an equality of power, for as Onslow had about 800 voters and the other four counties had about 4000 voters, it would be making 800 men equal to 4000, or making one man equal to five. And I argued that it would be necessary for those who advocated the proposed amendment to the Constitution on this ground, to change the basis of representation to the white population principle, so that one white man in one section of the State would be of equal weight to a white man in any other section—that the advocates of the doctrine, to be consistent men, must go for the change. Such was, I think, my argument; it was certainly my meaning. Yet in a rapid debate, heard only once, gentlemen might have adopted the opinion that I was advocating the establishment of the White Basis. While on the same subject, I stated that the recent Democratic Convention had proposed to change the Constitution by extending the right of voting for members of the General Assembly and of electing the Judges by the people; that the Whig Convention not only proposed these changes, but also the question of electing the Officers of State and Justices of the Peace by the people; that the Whigs had thus gone further than the Democrats, and I remarked playfully, that therefore I was a better Free Suffrage man than my opponent.

In regard to the federal basis of representation, I said in substance, that many persons in this State, myself among the number, were of the opinion that when the new basis of representation was established in our Constitution, slaves should properly constitute a large part in the composition. That slaves formed a most important item of calculation for both Houses of the Assembly; in the Commons slaves being estimated as persons by counting three fifths, and in the Senate as property by counting the amount of taxes paid on them into the public Treasury. In this connection I stated further, as an abstract proposition, that if I had to make a Constitution for a people ab initio (they having had no Constitution before) that white population should form the basis of representation in one branch at least of the law-making Department. But making a Constitution ab initio or from the start, a new Constitution for a new State, is a very different thing, in my judgment, from changing an old one already existing: existing upon compromises of sectional influences, and adjustments of antagonistic interests, like the Constitution of North Carolina. And it was a total mistake and misapprehension of my argument and opinions to suppose that I, at Wentworth or elsewhere, ever advocated the doctrine of changing our present Constitution so as to abolish federal and substitute white population as the representative basis! These were the opinions that I expressed myself ready "to stand up to and to swear by," and not the upturning of our Constitution and the abandonment of its compromises. I was not proposing a modification of our Constitution; for as I said in my printed address to the Whig Convention, "in my judgment it is no part of a Governor's duties or right to make or propose new Constitutions for the People."

Yet I have no doubt that those who have given Certificates about my speech understood me as they have stated and were honest in their convictions. But as I have already said, either they draw inferences not warranted by the argument, or my views were too ambiguously or obscurely expressed. And when my attention was drawn to the subject subsequently, that I had been so understood at Wentworth, it was promptly disavowed and my true position explained. This speech at Wentworth was made on the 29th of June. On the 3d of July, at Salem, my opponent stated in his address to the People, that he understood me at Wentworth as going in favor of changing our Constitution so as to adopt white for federal basis, &c. I interpreted for explanation and assured him that he had misunderstood me; that I did not advocate any such change, and when I came to reply, I explained my position more fully. This allegation was repeated by my opponent in our public discussions at various other places afterwards and always repudiated and disavowed by me, and on some occasions with surprise and warmth that he should persist in alluding to it after he had been so repeatedly disavowed. These often repeated disclaimers too, it will be observed, were made in a part of the State where the doctrine is understood to be popular and where it might have been received with great favor by those whom I addressed.

On the 17th of July, when on the eve of leaving Morganton, I received information for the first time, that Circulars and Handbills had been sent into the Eastern part of the State, where this change in the Constitution is very unpopular, stating that I was advocating this doctrine in the West. The information given me was quite indefinite; I had seen no newspapers; no time nor place was particularized where such sentiments had been expressed by me, but the general idea merely was conveyed to my mind by the intelligence, that it was set forth and circulated in the East on the eve of the election, when but little time was allowed for explanation there, that I was conducting the campaign on the issue; that in other words I had come out for it and was travelling through the West urging it before the People. Under the impulse arising from this gross injustice, I wrote short notes to the Editor of the Register and other Whig papers in the State denouncing the charge as false. Having no time to write explanations, I contented myself with a simple denial and requested a friend who had heard me at Wilkesboro', Leont and Morganton, to write to the Register and explain the matter. This he did on the 27th, in the Register, and fully sustains what I here state. I know that I was advocating no such doctrine, and pronounced the charge to be false. Every respectable man of both parties among the thousands who heard me in the West, from Salem to Cherokee, knows it to be false. They all know that I not only did not advocate the doctrine, but that on all occasions, when brought to my notice, I expressly repudiated and disavowed it.

In my communications to the Presses, I had no reference to the Certificate of Messrs. T. Ruffin, Jr., and others addressed to the Standard. My communication was written and dated 17th July, at Morganton. Mr. Ruffin's certificate is dated 16th July at Wentworth, the place being 150 miles apart, and appears for the first time in the Standard on the 20th—three days after the date of my communication, and which in fact I never saw until after the close of the Campaign on my return from Cherokee. Of course, I could have known nothing about it when I wrote and could not have referred to it. Where then arises this question of veracity, and whence the necessity of Mr. Ruffin's "Card to the Public," to vindicate his certificate which had no public existence at the time I wrote it?

That Messrs. Ruffin and others may have understood me as taking ground set forth in their Certificate, I have already admitted. But I say they were mistaken. Whether that was their fault or mine, I shall not say. One word in conclusion. Their Certificate of the doctrines therein imputed to me was made on the 2nd of July, and continued up to the 16th. If at the date of their Certificate on the 16th, they were apprised of my disclaimer and explanation, I leave to their own sense of justice and fairness to decide, their purpose in setting forth the Certificate, being, as Mr. Ruffin says, "in a Card to the Public, to meet and correct the misrepresentations of a portion of the Whig Press," whether I ought not to have received it at their hands, voluntarily or "set things to rights," to the benefit of my disclaimer and explanation! CHARLES MANLY.

THE MISSOURI RESTRICTION—
VOTE OF 1850.

In the late great debate in the United States Senate repeated references were made to the sectional character of the vote in Congress on the adoption of the Missouri compromise in 1820. Senators on both sides quoted from memory and made great mistakes; none of them appear to have looked with any attention into that part of the history of the transaction. We have had the curiosity to hunt up the list of yeas and nays on the critical divisions, and think our readers may be interested in an analysis of the vote.

The controversy, it will be remembered, did not arise on the question of admitting the State of Missouri into the Union, but on the preliminary bill, authorizing the inhabitants of the territory to form a constitution and State Government. To that bill an amendment was moved in the House of Representatives, in the nature of a mandate to the new State, that it should in its constitution "ordain and establish that there should be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the new State, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted; which are the terms of the North-western ordinance of 1787. The chief champions of the restriction were Mr. John W. Taylor, of New York, and Mr. John Sergeant, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, and Mr. Rufus King, of New York, in the Senate. After a stormy debate which consumed the whole country, and a multitude of amendments and propositions which failed, the House of Representatives passed the proposed restriction, and sent the bill containing it to the Senate. The Senate had discussed the same question contemporaneously, and there too, numerous attempts at compromise had been tried unsuccessfully. Among them was one to settle the question by resuming all restriction from the Missouri bill—re-establishing all attempts to restrict States, and dividing the territory of the United States at 36 30, prohibiting the existence of slavery north of the line. All the territories south of that line were then de facto slaveholding, and declaring to legislate was equivalent to an agreement that slavery should not be abolished there.

This, though it failed several times, was afterwards passed, and is now known as the Missouri compromise. The author of the proposition was John W. Taylor, a Senator from New York, who was at that time actually required to be the author, and it is difficult to alter that impression in the popular mind. But Mr. Clay has repeatedly disclaimed it, and assigned it to the true source—Mr. Clay supported it most strongly by his influence and oratory in the lower House, but it failed there, and first succeeded in the Senate. Mr. Clay's powers of leadership in the work of pacification were most conspicuous in the next Congress, on another controversy, arising out of the Missouri case, which at that time threatened very dangerous consequences. Missouri presented herself to Congress with a constitution which directed the State Legislature to pass laws excluding free negroes and mulattoes from the State. There was an attempt to keep her out of the Union, unless she altered this part of the constitution; which the free State members construed as an interference with the rights of citizenship under the constitution. It was in this disquieting question that Mr. Clay obtained the appointment of his compromise committee, and reported from that a compromise which was so ingeniously worded as to save the point of pride with both parties, and leave the details of the question to the Judiciary.

The restrictive amendment to the bill of 1820 was, as we have stated, passed in the House, and sent to the Senate. In that body the successful effort was then made to free Missouri entirely from restriction, and to adopt the line of division of 36 30 for the territories.

MR. BARBER, of Virginia—March 2d, 1820—moved to strike out the whole proviso requiring the State to restrict slavery. It was carried—yeas 27, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Parrott, of New Hampshire; Hunter, of Rhode Island; Linn, of Connecticut; Thomas and Edwards, of Illinois; Barlow, of Virginia; Brown, of Louisiana; Easton, of Tennessee; Elliot, of Georgia; Graham, of South Carolina; Hays, of Delaware; Johnson, of Kentucky; Johnson, of Louisiana; King, of Alabama; Lloyd, of Maryland; Logan, of Kentucky; Luke, of Mississippi; Mason, of North Carolina; Pinkney, of Maryland; Pleasants, of Virginia; Smith, of South Carolina; Stokes, of North Carolina; Van Dyke, of Delaware; Walker, of Alabama; Walker, of Georgia; Williams, of Mississippi; Williams, of Tennessee.

NAYS—Messrs. Burritt, of Rhode Island; Morrill, of New Hampshire; Otis and Mellen, of Massachusetts; Dana, of Connecticut; King and Sanford, of New York; Dickinson and Wilson, of New Jersey; Lowrie and Roberts, of Pennsylvania; Ruggles and Trimble, of Ohio; Noble and Taylor, of Indiana.

ABSENT—Fletcher and Palmer, of Vermont.

It will be seen that this was a sectional vote, with the exception that five Senators from free States voted for striking out the restriction. They were Parrott, of New Hampshire; Linn, of Rhode Island; King and Sanford, of New York; and the two Illinois Senators, Thomas and Edwards. The Union then consisted of twenty-two States, and they were equally divided into slaveholding and non-slaveholding States.

After striking out the restriction in the Senate, the compromise proviso, as to the territories, was adopted without division, and the bill was returned to the House for concurrence.

On the same day the House considered those amendments and adopted them both. The first, striking out the restriction on Missouri, was concurred in by a very close vote

THE MISSOURI RESTRICTION— VOTE OF 1850.

In the late great debate in the United States Senate repeated references were made to the sectional character of the vote in Congress on the adoption of the Missouri compromise in 1820. Senators on both sides quoted from memory and made great mistakes; none of them appear to have looked with any attention into that part of the history of the transaction. We have had the curiosity to hunt up the list of yeas and nays on the critical divisions, and think our readers may be interested in an analysis of the vote.

The controversy, it will be remembered, did not arise on the question of admitting the State of Missouri into the Union, but on the preliminary bill, authorizing the inhabitants of the territory to form a constitution and State Government. To that bill an amendment was moved in the House of Representatives, in the nature of a mandate to the new State, that it should in its constitution "ordain and establish that there should be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the new State, otherwise than in the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted; which are the terms of the North-western ordinance of 1787. The chief champions of the restriction were Mr. John W. Taylor, of New York, and Mr. John Sergeant, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, and Mr. Rufus King, of New York, in the Senate. After a stormy debate which consumed the whole country, and a multitude of amendments and propositions which failed, the House of Representatives passed the proposed restriction, and sent the bill containing it to the Senate. The Senate had discussed the same question contemporaneously, and there too, numerous attempts at compromise had been tried unsuccessfully. Among them was one to settle the question by resuming all restriction from the Missouri bill—re-establishing all attempts to restrict States, and dividing the territory of the United States at 36 30, prohibiting the existence of slavery north of the line. All the territories south of that line were then de facto slaveholding, and declaring to legislate was equivalent to an agreement that slavery should not be abolished there.

This, though it failed several times, was afterwards passed, and is now known as the Missouri compromise. The author of the proposition was John W. Taylor, a Senator from New York, who was at that time actually required to be the author, and it is difficult to alter that impression in the popular mind. But Mr. Clay has repeatedly disclaimed it, and assigned it to the true source—Mr. Clay supported it most strongly by his influence and oratory in the lower House, but it failed there, and first succeeded in the Senate. Mr. Clay's powers of leadership in the work of pacification were most conspicuous in the next Congress, on another controversy, arising out of the Missouri case, which at that time threatened very dangerous consequences. Missouri presented herself to Congress with a constitution which directed the State Legislature to pass laws excluding free negroes and mulattoes from the State. There was an attempt to keep her out of the Union, unless she altered this part of the constitution; which the free State members construed as an interference with the rights of citizenship under the constitution. It was in this disquieting question that Mr. Clay obtained the appointment of his compromise committee, and reported from that a compromise which was so ingeniously worded as to save the point of pride with both parties, and leave the details of the question to the Judiciary.

The restrictive amendment to the bill of 1820 was, as we have stated, passed in the House, and sent to the Senate. In that body the successful effort was then made to free Missouri entirely from restriction, and to adopt the line of division of 36 30 for the territories.

MR. BARBER, of Virginia—March 2d, 1820—moved to strike out the whole proviso requiring the State to restrict slavery. It was carried—yeas 27, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Parrott, of New Hampshire; Hunter, of Rhode Island; Linn, of Connecticut; Thomas and Edwards, of Illinois; Barlow, of Virginia; Brown, of Louisiana; Easton, of Tennessee; Elliot, of Georgia; Graham, of South Carolina; Hays, of Delaware; Johnson, of Kentucky; Johnson, of Louisiana; King, of Alabama; Lloyd, of Maryland; Logan, of Kentucky; Luke, of Mississippi; Mason, of North Carolina; Pinkney, of Maryland; Pleasants, of Virginia; Smith, of South Carolina; Stokes, of North Carolina; Van Dyke, of Delaware; Walker, of Alabama; Walker, of Georgia; Williams, of Mississippi; Williams, of Tennessee.

NAYS—Messrs. Burritt, of Rhode Island; Morrill, of New Hampshire; Otis and Mellen, of Massachusetts; Dana, of Connecticut; King and Sanford, of New York; Dickinson and Wilson, of New Jersey; Lowrie and Roberts, of Pennsylvania; Ruggles and Trimble, of Ohio; Noble and Taylor, of Indiana.

ABSENT—Fletcher and Palmer, of Vermont.

It will be seen that this was a sectional vote, with the exception that five Senators from free States voted for striking out the restriction. They were Parrott, of New Hampshire; Linn, of Rhode Island; King and Sanford, of New York; and the two Illinois Senators, Thomas and Edwards. The Union then consisted of twenty-two States, and they were equally divided into slaveholding and non-slaveholding States.

After striking out the restriction in the Senate, the compromise proviso, as to the territories, was adopted without division, and the bill was returned to the House for concurrence.

On the same day the House considered those amendments and adopted them both. The first, striking out the restriction on Missouri, was concurred in by a very close vote

—yeas 90, nays 67—majority 23. We have no room for a full list of the yeas and nays. The point of interest is the sectional character of the vote, and the names of the parties who decided the question by voting with the South. The whole number of representatives from the southern States voted for concurrence with fourteen members from non-slaveholding States. These were Mason, Hill, Shaw and Holmes of Massachusetts; Foote and Stevens, of Connecticut; Eddy, of Rhode Island; Bloomfield, Kinney and Smith, of New Jersey; Meigs and Starrs, of New York; Baldwin and Kelleys, of Pennsylvania.

With these exceptions every vote from a free State was cast against concurring, of which the effect would have been to retain the prohibition of slavery in the State of Missouri.

The character of the vote may be further judged by the fact that there were eight absentees, of whom five were estimated to be against concurring and three for it. The actual majority in a full House, against imposing, by act of Congress, restriction upon the admission of slavery into the State, was only one, excluding the Speaker, Mr. Clay, who was not entitled to vote.

After the restriction was expunged, the Missouri compromise line was adopted by a large majority, 133 to 42. Thirty-seven Southern men, who had voted to strike out the restriction, voted against inserting the compromise proviso. Forty Southern men (a majority) voted with the North to impose the territorial restriction north of 36 30.—Only five Northern members voted in the negative.—N. O. Pic.

Jenny Lind.

BY FRANKLIN K. BREMER.

There once was a poor and plain little girl, dwelling in a little room, in Stockholm, the capital of Sweden. She was a poor little girl indeed then. She was neglected; and would have been very unhappy, deprived of the kindness and care so necessary to a child, if it had not been for a peculiar gift. The little girl had a fine voice, and in her loneliness, in trouble or in sorrow, she comforted herself by singing. In fact, she sung to all she did; at her work, at her play, running or resting, she always sang.

The woman who had her in care—so that to work during the day, and used to look in the little girl—who had nothing to divert her from her work and her play, and who sang—once she sat by the window, and stroked her out and sang, when melody passed by. She heard a voice, and looked up, and saw the little singer. She asked the child several questions, went away, and came back several days after, followed by an old music master, whose name was Crelius. He tried the little girl's musical ear and voice, and he was astonished. He took her to the Director of the Royal Opera at Stockholm, then a Count Palm, whose truly generous and kind heart was reconciled by a rough speech and morbid temper. Crelius introduced his little pupil to the Count, and asked him to engage her as "eleon" for the opera. "You ask a foolish thing," said the Count gruffly, looking down fully down on the poor little girl. "What shall we do with that ugly thing? See what feet she has? And then her face! She will never be presentable. No, we cannot take her! Away with her!"

The music master insisted, almost impatiently. "Well," exclaimed he at last, "if you will not take her, poor as I am, I will take her myself, and have her educated for the scene; then, such another ear as she has for music, is not to be found in the whole world."

The Count relented. The little girl was at last admitted into the school for elves at the opera, and with some difficulty, a simple gown of blue and white was procured for her. The care of her musical education was left to an able master, Mr. Albert Berg, director of the song school of the opera.

Some years later, at a comedy given by the elves of the theatre, several persons were struck by the spirit and life with which a very young elve acted the part of a beggar girl in the play. Lovers of genial nature were charmed, and almost frightened. It was not poor little girl, who had made her first appearance, now about fourteen years of age, frolicsome and full of fun as a child.

A few years still later, a young debutante was to sing for the first time before the public in Weber's Frischutz. At the rehearsal preceding, the representation of the evening, she sang in a manner which made the members of the orchestra at once, as by common accord, lay down their instruments to clap their hands in rapturous applause. It was not a plain little girl here again, who now had grown up, and was to appear before the public in the role of Agatha. I saw her at the evening representation. She was then in the prime of youth, fresh, bright, and serene as a morning in May, perfect in form—her hands and arms peculiarly graceful—and lovely in her whole appearance, through the expression of her countenance, and the noble simplicity and calmness of her manners. In fact she was charming. We saw not an actress, but a young girl full of natural gentleness and grace. She seemed to move, speak, and sing without an effort of art. All was nature and harmony. Her song was distinguished especially by its purity, and the power of soul which seemed to swell her tones. Her "mezzo voice" was delightful. In the night scene where Agatha, seeing her overcome, breathes out her joy in rapturous song, our young singer, on turning from the window, at the back of the theatre, to the